DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 791 CE 027 156

AUTHOR Hoyt, Kenneth B.
TITLE YEDPA and Career Education. Monographs on Career Education.
INSTITUTION Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 78
NOTE 45p.
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402 (Stock No. 017-080-01889-6)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents: Adult Education: Career Education: Cooperation: *Economically Disadvantaged: Educational Opportunities: Education Work Relationship: *Employment Programs: *Federal Legislation: *Federal Programs: Interaction: Postsecondary Education: Program Descriptions: School Districts: Secondary Education: Underemployment: Unemployment: Vocational Education: Young Adults: *Youth Employment: Youth Opportunities: Youth Problems: *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: *Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act: Youth Employment Training Program: Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects

ABSTRACT

This monograph summarizes discussions by participants at two mini-conferences who were involved in beginning attempts to implement the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) legislation. The first section presents a historical overview of YEDPA which focuses on a monograph by Garth L. Mangum. Both ineffective and effective program strategies are listed. The second section then describes the YEDPA legislation (which is currently being rewritten). Five concerns of prime sponsors regarding interactions among Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), YEDPA, and local education agencies (LEAs) are then discussed. The next section summarizes Youth Incentive Entitlement Projects (YIEP) efforts in Seattle, Washington: Detroit, Michigan: Boston, Massachusetts: Cincinnati, Ohio: and Baltimore, Maryland. A summary of problems encountered in early Youth Employment Training Programs (YETP) efforts as well as some examples of ways in which YETP programs supplement educational opportunities follow. Concluding sections list nine recommendations for increasing the effectiveness of YEDPA and four philosophical issues which should be resolved in LEA/prime sponsor agreements. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED194791

MONOGRAPHS ON CAREER EDUCATION

YEDPA AND CAREER EDUCATION

by
Kenneth B. Hoyt, *Director*
Office of Career Education
Office of Education

May 1978

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Joseph A. Califano, Jr., *Secretary*
Mary F. Berry, *Assistant Secretary for Education*

Office of Education
Ernest L. Boyer, *Commissioner*

CE 027 156

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Preface

During the period covering November 1977, through May 1978, OE's Office of Career Education sponsored, through a contract with Inter-America Research Associates a series of mini-conferences devoted to the general topic of The Concept of Collaboration in Career Education. This monograph is one in a series of OCE monographs aimed at providing a narrative summary of ideas and thoughts gathered from particular community segments represented in this series of mini-conferences.

Participants in each mini-conference associated with a particular segment of the broader community were selected for OCE and Inter-America Research Associates by the organization itself. Lists of all participants whose thoughts are summarized in this monograph are presented as Appendix A of this monograph. It is important to recognize that, while participants are properly thought of as *representatives* from the particular community segment involved, they are, in no way, to be thought of as *representing* that community segment. That is, each participant was encouraged to speak only for herself/himself. No formal organizational or institutional commitment was sought nor should be inferred from the contents of this monograph.

In general, each mini-conference involved from 10-15 participants. Each lasted two days with the discussion sessions chaired by the Director, Office of Career Education, USOE. Participants in each mini-conference developed their own agenda through a process that asked them to list topics or issues they thought pertinent to discuss. Once such a list was developed, participants then picked those that appealed most to a majority of the participants for extended discussion. The list of issues and questions, themselves, provide a series of interesting insights into concerns of participants regarding their organizations and career education. A complete listing of the issues and concerns raised by participants in the mini-conferences reported in this monograph appears as Appendix B. Readers are urged to study this list carefully.

Notes for each mini-conference were taken personally by the Director, Office of Career Education. Based on such notes, the series of monographs of which this is one has been prepared. The complete notes for each mini-conference have been compiled by Inter-America Research Associates and published as a separate document. Limited copies of this document are available, so long as the supply lasts, to those requesting them from OE's Office of Career Education.

No pretense is made that this monograph represents a comprehensive treatment of the topic. There is no way that, in only two days of discussion, a comprehensive coverage could have been accomplished by the small group of participants involved. This monograph is properly viewed as an attempt to report, as fully as possible, the discussions that took place. By and large, the contents of this monograph are limited to ideas and thoughts of the participants. At times, some of my own personal thoughts and opinions are interwoven into the discussion, but the natural temptation to do so has been resisted insofar as possible.

Primary expressions of thanks for this monograph must go to the participants themselves who donated two full days of their time, without an honorarium, to sharing their thoughts with me and, through this monograph, with you. In addition, special thanks and recognition must be expressed to Dr. William Mermis, Professor, Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville, who served as Consultant to Inter-America Research Associates and assisted me in the conduct of these mini-conferences. Finally, thanks are also due Dr. Brady Fletcher and Ms. Odie Esparza of Inter-America Research Associates for their expert logistical assistance.

Kenneth B. Hoyt, Director
Office of Career Education
U.S. Office of Education

Introduction

The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (YEDPA) was signed into law by President Carter in August 1977. Administered through the Secretary of Labor, the YEDPA legislation represents a major new Administration thrust aimed at problems associated with youth employment, unemployment, and underemployment with special emphasis on needs of economically disadvantaged youth. In addition, and pertinent to the contents of this monograph, the YEDPA legislation also mandated close working relationships between Department of Labor (DOL) prime sponsors and the educational community.

Using an initial Congressional appropriation of $1 billion, the YEDPA legislation moved into operation before the end of 1977. Both the newness and the magnitude of the undertaking associated with this legislation made it difficult to mount local efforts that represented a clear understanding of either the congressional intent or the conceptual basis of YEDPA. In spite of these handicaps, a great number of communities found themselves able to move quickly into some kinds of YEDPA operations. They were, to be sure, embryonic in nature, but they did represent a beginning.

Some of the persons most deeply involved in these beginning attempts to implement the YEDPA legislation were nominated by YEDPA officials in the U.S. Department of Labor to serve as participants in the two mini-conferences whose discussions are summarized in this monograph. Some of the participants were employed by CETA prime sponsors and others by local K-12 school systems. While, of course, the YEDPA legislation was necessarily new to them, none were without considerable experience in dealing with problems of youth employment/unemployment. Because of the newness of the YEDPA effort, it seems reasonable to expect that the thoughts of some participants reflected in this monograph will probably change considerably as they gain more experience in YEDPA activities.

Antecedents of YEDPA: An Historical Perspective

Those who wish to understand the nature and implications of the YEDPA legislation will gain much from spending some time studying Department of Labor (DOL) efforts that preceded this legislation. An excellent historical overview has been prepared for OCE by Dr. Garth L. Mangum, distinguished Professor of Economics, University of Utah, and published, as an OCE

monograph, under the title *Career Education and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act.* This monograph appropriately begins by summarizing some observations gained from studying the Mangum monograph.

The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (MDTA), the Job Corps program of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (EOA), and the Work Incentive Program (WIN) created by amendments to the Social Security Act of 1967 are viewed by Mangum as prior elements of manpower legislation having some implications for career education. Of these, the program most directly related to the current YEDPA legislation was the MDTA program. In this program the law, in effect, called for the education system to provide manpower training and for DOL to create and/or find jobs for MDTA graduates. It was a "forced marriage" between education and DOL but one where DOL possessed most of the money.

The Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) became law in 1973 and was first implemented in FY 1975. For purposes of this discussion, the most notable changes from MDTA to CETA were: (a) CETA removed the "forced marriage" between education and labor (although it provided multiple opportunities for voluntary interaction between the two); and (b) it established a system of CETA prime sponsors located in major metropolitan areas around the USA (approximately 450 CETA prime sponsors now exist) who are responsible, through such local agencies as the Office of the Mayor, for administering CETA programs in their locality.

Mangum points out that there is nothing called for under the YEDPA legislation that was not *permissible* under CETA. The prime differences YEDPA has made are that it has: (a) made available much greater sums of money targeted specifically at youth; and (b) it has mandated LEA/DOL prime sponsor relationships. While concentrated on both economically disadvantaged youth and adults, Mangum reports, nearly 60 percent of CETA Title I 1976 program participants were 21 or under. Some of the more innovative CETA youth programs are described extensively in *CETA and Youth* published by the National League of Cities and United States Conference of Majors in 1977. Mangum provides brief descriptions of several of these including:

1. Harbor City Learning Program–Baltimore, Maryland
2. Community Based Career Exploration Program–Bremen, Georgia
3. Work Experience Program–Albuquerque, New Mexico
4. CETA Youth Program–Oakland, California
5. Student Work Experience Program–St. Louis, Missouri
6. Youth Career Exploration and Employment Project–St. Paul, Minnesota
7. Project Cooperation–Salt Lake City, Utah
8. Youth-Community Coordination Project–Savannah, Georgia

Each of these programs is aimed at helping economically disadvantaged youth to better prepare themselves to function effectively in the occupational society. Some programs consist of special added efforts provided for in-school economically disadvantaged youth. Others operate, at least in part, as alternative school programs established in conjunction with a local school system. Still others operate as true alternative programs, completely independent of the school system, for out-of-school youth. Work experience is a common component of all of these programs. CETA youth programs can be generally characterized, it seems to me, as efforts aimed at providing special intensive help in career awareness/exploration/planning aimed at what are regarded as special needs of economically disadvantaged youth.

In addition to these kinds of localized CETA-financed youth programs, CETA funds have also been used to support several broader efforts with which many readers of this document will be familiar. For example, the National Alliance of Business (NAB)—including its Vocational Exploration in the Private Sector (VEPS) Program—is funded through CETA. The VEPS program has been a highly successful effort that provides vocational exploratory opportunities during the school year (and with more intensive efforts during the summer months) to economically disadvantaged youth who are prospective dropouts. So, too, is the network of 21 community education/work councils—organized by Willard Wirtz and his associates at the National Manpower Institute—a CETA-funded effort.

In terms of programs for economically disadvantaged in-school high school youth, CETA efforts, prior to YEDPA, were largely concentrated across the nation in two areas: (a) providing paid work experience, under a cooperative work experience-type arrangement, to youth enrolled in secondary school vocational education programs; and (b) providing summer employment for youth. Often, various forms of instensive counseling and career exploration have also been included.

Beginning with research accumulated under the original MDTA program and continuing through that conducted under the Economic Opportunity Act, the WIN program, and the wide array of CETA operations, Mangum reviews a number of documents aimed at providing evidence of what works and what doesn't seem to work well in solving education/work problems faced by economically disadvantaged youth. Readers will want to study both the Mangum monograph and the original research documents he cites to gain the full importance and significance of what has been, in effect, a highly active research effort lasting more than 15 years. Here, only the generalizations Mangum draws will be quoted.

Among the relatively *ineffective* program strategies on which research evidence has been accumulated, Mangum highlights the following kinds of activities:

1. Attempts to return dropouts to *traditional* schools; i.e., the same ones or ones similar to those they originally dropped out from;

2. Restricting enrollments only to the most severely disadvantaged;

3. Programs of complete remediation and comprehensive services (such as the original Job Corps programs);

4. Programs consisting only of in-school and summer work experience; i.e., work experience *by itself*;

5. The Work Incentive Program (WIN);

6. Programs of intensive counseling–i.e., counseling *by itself*;

7. Programs seeking to refine school-to-work transition mechanisms (operating independent from efforts to improve the education system);

8. Rural programs consisting of work experience and visitation to urban areas.

One the other hand, Mangum's review of the research also identified a number of program strategies that do appear to suggest evidence of demonstrated effectiveness. Among such efforts, the following are highlighted by Mangum:

1. Programs aimed at increasing levels of educational attainment (especially those aimed at encouraging high school graduation);

2. Work experience directly related to vocational objectives (experience that promotes career exploration, career decisionmaking, and is associated with probabilities of employment);

3. Increasing the extent of labor market information and world-of-work understanding;

4. Programs offering career education and labor market exposure (with special recognition to Experienced Based Career Education);

5. Vocational education *coupled* with systematic career counseling;

6. Program strategies to improve individuals' coping skills (e.g., developing and executing plans, working with others, controlling impulses, communicating, problem solving, working within an authority structure);

7. Experiencing rewards for accomplishments (i.e., rewarding work when it occurs).

Those readers experienced in the "how-to-do-its" of career education will recognize more than a slight resemblence between those strategies research has demonstrated to be most effective and the strategies suggested for implementing career education. It is with this perspective that we now turn to a similarly brief overview of the YEDPA legislation itself.

An Overview of YEDPA

P.L. 95-93 is known as the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (or YEDPA, for short). With an initial appropriation of $1.0 billion, it is certainly one of the most ambitious programs ever launched that attempts to alleviate the youth employment/unemployment/underemployment problem. As these words are being written, the YEDPA legislation is currently being rewritten. It appears that it may wind up being called Part A, Youth Employment Demonstration Programs of a revised Title IV of CETA. Assuming this happens, Part A is expected to be divided into three major parts.

Subpart 1 will be known as the Youth Incentive Entitlement Projects and is expected to receive approximately 15% of the total appropriations for Title IV, Part A. The YIEP is best thought of as a massive experiment aimed at determining whether providing paid work experience for in-school, high risk, potential dropouts will lead them to remain in high school until graduation. A second emphasis of YIEP is to investigate whether providing paid work experience for youth who have recently dropped out of high school will motivate them to return to high school and remain to graduate. In addition to provision of paid work experience, the YIEP effort also provides participants with information and counseling to help them see career-related reasons for remaining in high school. Aimed primarily at economically disadvantaged youth, ages 16-19, the YIEP effort may operate under the direction of a CETA prime sponsor or under the direction of a school district. Prime sponsors may apply to the U.S. Department of Labor to conduct a YIEP program and if funded, either conduct it themselves or subcontract YIEP to a school system. Like all YEDPA programs, a major part of YIEP is designed to assure academic credit for YIEP participants in their work experience programs.

Because it is regarded as an experimental, rather than an operational effort, YIEP funds are concentrated in the hands of relatively few CETA prime

sponsors rather than spread over all 450+ prime sponsors. The YIEP cost per participant is expected to be high, but this is considered as part of the experimental design. The entire YIEP experiment is being conducted under the general direction of an independent, non-profit agency, Measurement Research Development Corporation (MRDC) that has received YIEP funds for this purpose. During FY '78, approximately $115 million was scheduled to be spent for the YIEP effort. This amount is expected to increase for FY '79. Subpart 2 will be known as the Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects (YCCIP). Aimed at economically disadvantaged youth ages 16-19, the YCCIP effort is perhaps best thought of as a special kind of cooperative work experience program for which both in-school and out-of-school youth are eligible. It seeks to provide participants with opportunity to obtain paid work experience while acquiring specific vocational skills, to expand the options for vocational skill training beyond those offered by the public school system, and to provide participants with general employability skills (such as good work habits, understanding and appreciation of the discipline of the work place, etc.). Participants in this program will learn vocational skills while engaged in community rehabilitation projects of various kinds primarily in the urban areas where they live. YCCIP funds go to CETA prime sponsors from DOL through the States on a formula basis. School districts, as well as community-based organizations, are considered eligible applicants to a prime sponsor who can compete for the privilege of subcontracting a YCCIP effort. It is not known, at this time, what proportion of YCCIP participants will be in-school, as opposed to out-of-school, youth. A substantial emphasis is almost certain to be put, at any rate, on out-of-school youth. Academic credit is to be sought for participants. As with YIEP, this program was targeted for $115 million during FY '78 and this is expected to increase in FY '79. Approximately 15 percent of all YEDPA funds will be earmarked for YCCIP.

Subpart 3, the Youth Employment Training Program (YETP), is by far the largest part of the proposed new YDPA with approximately 70 percent of all YDPA funds earmarked for this subpart. This is becoming best known to educators as the "22 percent subpart of YEDPA." This label refers to the fact that, under the YEDPA legislation, a *minimum* of 22 percent of all YETP funds received by a prime sponsor from the U.S. Department of Labor *must* be spent for in-school youth under provisions of an agreement between the prime sponsor and a local K-12 school district. Three important features of this provision must be clearly understood: (a) the 22 percent is a minimum, not a maximum, and school districts are free to negotiate with their prime sponsors for an even greater portion of YETP funds; (b) the 22 percent (or whatever percent is eventually agreed to) may be used for in-school youth under either a financial or a non-financial agreement with the school district—i.e., it is *not* automatic that the school district will actually receive cash dollars; and (c) if the prime sponsor finds it impossible to sign an agreement with a school

district under this subpart, the prime sponsor must return 22 percent of the YETP funds allocated to the prime sponsor back to the U.S. Department of Labor.

Two major kinds of youth participation are possible under the in-school portion of YETP. The first is called the "career employment experience program" and is limited to economically disadvantaged youth, ages 16-21. This program provides such youth with work experience *whose primary purpose is career exploration*, with specific vocational skills, and with all of the support services to be described below under the general heading of "Transition Services."

The second kind of in-school youth participation possible under YETP is known as "Transition Services" and is available to *all* in-school youth ages 16-21, not just to economically disadvantaged youth. Transition services include: (a) counseling (including career counseling); (b) occupational, educational, and labor market information of a national, State, and local nature; (c) assistance in making the transition from school to work; (d) career exploration experiences in both the public and private sector; (e) job placement assistance; (f) assistance in combatting race and sex stereotyping as deterrents to full freedom of educational and occupational choice; and (g) several other kinds of support services including, for example, child care services if needed.

It will be noted that youth ages 16-21 are eligible participants under YETP. This obviously *could* include youth enrolled in postsecondary education settings as well as high school youth. The LEA/prime sponsor agreement called for under YETP, however, must be executed between a CETA prime sponsor and a K-12 school district. The K-12 school district can, in turn, then make a subcontract with a postsecondary education institution for part of the in-school YETP effort.

Many educators appear to have overlooked the fact that up to 78 percent of YETP funds can be expended by CETA prime sponsors, under arrangements with various kinds of community-based organizations, for out-of-school youth, ages 16-21. Such youth will receive the same kinds of "career employment experiences" as are afforded economically disadvantaged in-school youth. Whether one is talking about a YETP effort for in-school or for out-of-school youth, it is apparent that the variety of services offered participating youth cover almost the entire range of those activities that the Mangum summary of research presented earlier indicates to be most effective *as a total package*. The YETP effort, unlike some other parts of YEDPA, is a longer range preventive/developmental approach to the youth education/work relationship dilemma.

Several additional key points must be emphasized with respect to the very complicated provisions of YETP. First, the minimum of 22 percent of YETP funds for in-school youths is clearly restricted to work experience which, according to the law, "will improve their ability to make career decisions. . . ." Thus, if the LEA/prime sponsor agreement is to contain provisions for "transition services," these must be over and beyond the minimal 22 percent. Second, under YETP, youth councils must be established at the community level. The membership and functions of these councils are very similar to those envisioned in the general community education/work council concept. Third, the in-school portion of YETP is to be administered by the participating education agency, not the DOL prime sponsor.

Fourth, 5 percent of YETP funds must be made available to the Governor of each State for establishing and operating a special statewide youth services plan to (1) provide labor market and occupational information; (2) provide establishment of cooperative efforts between State and local institutions—including occupational and career guidance, counseling, and placement for both in-school and out-of-school youth—as well as for three other purposes.

Fifth, up to 10 percent of YETP funds can be used for comprehensive YETP efforts involving youth from all socioeconomic backgrounds, rather than being only limited to economically disadvantaged youth.

Sixth, under special provisions, a portion of the YETP funds may be used for 14-15-year-old youth.

In addition to these three major subparts, YEDPA (or YDPA as it may be known if the Congress makes into law certain proposals) contains provisions for sizeable amounts of discretionary research and development moneys for use by the Secretary of Labor. A sizeable portion of such funds has recently been used to establish a nonprofit corporation known as Youth Work, Inc. Under the direction of Dr. Corinne Rieder (formerly of NIE), Youth Work, Inc., can be expected to fund a wide variety of projects aimed at increasing knowledge and understanding of youth education/work relationship problems and effective approaches to helping youth solve such problems.

In March 1978, a landmark memorandum of understanding was signed by the Secretary of the Department of Labor and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This memorandum commits personnel from both DOL and HEW to work cooperatively toward effectively implementing the YEDPA legislation.

This very brief overview of the YEDPA legislation suggests to all those engaged in career education efforts, at both the K-12 and postsecondary levels, that great implications exist for interaction between the YEDPA effort and the

career education effort. It was primarily because of the obvious potential for interaction that two of the 1977-78 mini-conferences were devoted to a discussion of "YEDPA and Career Education." We turn now to a discussion of these two mini-conferences.

CETA, YEDPA, and LEA/Prime Sponsor Interactions: Thoughts of Prime Sponsors

If educators are to interact and work effectively with CETA prime sponsors, it is essential that they have some insights and appreciations with respect to thoughts and concerns of persons representing CETA prime sponsors. The purpose of this section is to identify and discuss several such concerns that emerged from the two YEDPA mini-conferences. No implication is intended that these thoughts and concerns are either: (a) typical of CETA prime sponsors nationwide; or (b) indicative of general attitudes existing within DOL. Rather, they simply represent thoughts expressed by one or more of the participants in these mini-conferences. Because DOL selected the mini-conference participants, it is assumed the participants represent thoughtful professional persons in the CETA/manpower field.

It is extremely unlikely that school officials, in their own interactions with CETA prime sponsor representatives, will hear expressed all or even a majority of the concerns reported here. That doesn't mean they don't exist. If educators will study and think about the concerns outlined here, it is hoped they will be better equipped to listen to and interact effectively with CETA prime sponsors in their own communities.

First, it is important for educators to understand the political/community pressures under which CETA prime sponsors operate. CETA manpower councils, composed of influential community leaders from both local government and from community-based organizations with primary concerns for the economically disadvantaged, largely control the operations and establish priorities for local CETA prime sponsors. Accountability demands placed on CETA prime sponsors force them to operate under a basic assumption that the "name of the game is *jobs*." With unemployment statistics running high for adults as well as for youth, the CETA prime sponsor is, by necessity, forced to order priorities in the following manner:

1st priority - remedial programs for adults
2nd priority - remedial programs for youth
3rd priority - preventive programs for youth

The CETA prime sponsor is in a situation where maximum credit will be gained through reducing adult unemployment rates in the area being served. No

matter how much the prime sponsor may care about youth, it is adults, not youth, who must receive first priority. In addition to unemployed adults, the CETA prime sponsor is faced daily with demands that some systematic help be given to reducing unemployment among the out-of-school, out-of-work, out-of-skill, and out-of-luck youth currently found in every large urban area of the nation. Many of these youth are not officially counted in the statistics on unemployment because they have indicated no desire to find a job. Yet, they do exist and they are of major concern to a wide variety of those who influence the actions–and the tenure–of the CETA prime sponsor. There is no good way the CETA prime sponsor can, operationally, express as great a concern for in-school as must be expressed for out-of-school youth.

The primary advantage accruing to the local CETA prime sponsor for preventive efforts aimed at in-school youth in that, in addition to the criterion of numbers of persons put back to work, the prime sponsor is also evaluated on the basis of a *per unit cost criterion.* Because preventive, as opposed to remedial programs, have an obviously lower per unit cost, they do have some appeal. The number one criterion, however, remains *jobs.* This has forced CETA prime sponsors to adopt a general strategy that calls for concentrating efforts on relatively few persons in need of remedial help rather than spreading their limited resources acorss the board in broad preventive efforts. To point out to the CETA prime sponsor that the per unit cost of a given activity is high, will not cause the prime sponsor to change priorities provided the present effort produces results in terms of jobs for those being served.

If educators in a given community feel their CETA prime sponsor is not devoting enough time to the priorities of the school system, it is important that such educators be aware of and reflect on these kinds of pressures that the CETA prime sponsor must live with on a daily basis.

Second, it is important for educators to recognize why some CETA prime sponsors may be resentful about the YETP requirement that a minimum of 22 percent of YETP funds be earmarked for use as provided for in an LEA/prime sponsor agreement. There are several basis on which such resentment may be expressed. One lies in the fact that CETA manpower councils are, to a large degree, controlled by community-based organizations (CBOs) who, like the school system, are also eligible to use YETP funds. The prime sponsor *must* pay attention to such CBOs and attempt to be helpful to them. As a result, many prime sponsors consider the 22 percent *minimum* to be an absolute *maximum* amount of YETP funds to be included in an LEA/prime sponsor agreement.

For several years now, school systems have been regarded by CETA prime sponsors as simply one among many CBOs through which CETA funds could legally flow. Now they find themselves faced with the YEDPA law that *requires* a minimum of 22 percent of their YETP money be included in the LEA/prime sponsor agreement. This has obviously taken away some of the flexibility that CETA prime sponsors previously enjoyed. While, in the past, they *could* enter into agreements with local school districts, they now find themselves in a position where they *must* do so. It is easy to understand why this may cause some resentment among CETA prime sponsors.

Another reason why some CETA prime sponsors may well resist using more than 22 percent of YETP funds for in-school youth, under the LEA/prime sponsor agreement, is that, through the variety of CBOs in the community, many career awareness, exploration, and preparation opportunities are already being made available to in-school youth. One participant, in a community where only 22 percent of YETP funds go into the LEA/prime sponsor agreement, reported that if activities of CBOs participating in YETP are counted, a total of 55 percent of YETP funds are being used for in-school youth.

It is important for educators to understand that the CETA prime sponsor must, of necessity, regard the school system as only one of a number of community resources available for use in carrying out the CETA mission. Further, in some communities, the school system may well not be the most effective organization for use by the CETA prime sponsor.

Third, some CETA prime sponsors are finding it difficult to differentiate what YEDPA asks them to do as opposed to what they were doing earlier through Title I and Title III of the original CETA legislation. CETA prime sponsors need clarification on such relationships. They need, even more, for educators who have not previously been involved in CETA prime sponsor relationships to know and appreciate previous CETA efforts on behalf of youth. In the past, the primary CETA involvement with K-12 school districts was through Title I of the original CETA legislation that was used, and was for the purpose of providing paid work experience for CETA eligible (economically disadvantaged, ages 16-21) youth to complement vocational education courses taken by such youth in the schools. This was, of course, a form of cooperative work experience and the arrangements were made with vocational education personnel in the schools. Sometimes such efforts operated as an integral part of cooperative work experience programs for academic credit and at other times they operated without academic credit. In the latter case, such efforts were more directed toward providing basic income maintenance for youth who needed money to continue in school; it was basically a continuation of what was formerly the Neighborhood Youth Corps program operating under EOA.

Not all of CETA prime sponsor past relationships with school districts were directly related to vocational education. For example, in school districts operating magnet schools, CETA officials, using Title I funds, could and did assign some youth enrolled in such schools to work part time in the general health field independent of any specific vocational skill preparation courses they might be taking in such a school. A second example could be found in a CETA contract with a CBO who provided part-time work experience programs for CETA eligible in-school youth to work in the community.

CETA funds have, for some time, been used to provide various kinds of summer work experience programs for in-school economically disadvantaged youth. One form of such work experience is represented by the Summer Program for Economically Disadvantaged Youth (SPEDY) funded under Title III of CETA which concentrates primary emphasis on supplying participants with *jobs* (as opposed to career exploration experiences) during the summer months. The second prime example here is the Vocational Exploration Program (VEP) conducted, using CETA Title III funds, jointly by NAB and the Human Resources Development Institute (HRDI) of the AFL/CIO. The VEP program is primarily aimed at providing CETA eligible youth work summer work experience programs having career exploration in the private sector as their primary goal.

Other Title III CETA youth efforts have included: (a) the OIC Career Intern Program; (b) youth work experience programs conducted through the National Urban League; and (c) 70001–a program tailored to meet training and work experience requirements for out-of-school economically disadvantaged youth in the fields of marketing and merchandising.

The new YEDPA legislation, with its complicated subparts, must be clearly understood both by educators and by CETA prime sponsors in relationship to such earlier CETA efforts as described above. One way of doing so would be to regard the YCCIP effort (subpart 2) as similar in nature to the cooperative work experience programs carried on with vocational educators during the school year under the original Title I provisions of CETA. If this is done, then the summer portion of YCCIP can be seen as most analogous to the SPEDY effort of CETA in former years. There has actually been no systematic counterpart to the YETP effort during the academic year, but the VEP program, with its emphasis on career exploration, is a reasonable analogy to summer experiences for YETP–eligible youth.

Part of the problem is that too many educators are unacquainted with the entire CETA law and with previous efforts of CETA prime sponsors. Part of the problem is that CETA prime sponsors have had difficulty relating YEDPA

provisions with previous operations conducted under other parts of the CETA legislation.

A fourth concern of CETA prime sponsor personnel is the LEA/prime sponsor agreement called for under the YETP portion of YEDPA. There are several subparts of this general concern, each of which deserves brief mention.

One of these has to do with clarifying exactly what schools are being asked to do under the LEA/prime sponsor agreement. It seemed clear to some participants that, basically, the agreement calls for schools to: (a) identify the CETA-eligible youth for YETP; (b) create some YETP part-time jobs within the school system for such youth (c) provide work site supervisors for YETP part-time work experience efforts; (d) provide academic credit for the YETP experiences; and (e) make periodic reports to the CETA prime sponsor. There was considerable doubt expressed about the extent to which school personnel understand and are prepared to accept obligations such as these.

A second sub-concern was expressed regarding the awarding of credit for YEDPA efforts in general and for YETP activities in particular. Participants pointed out that, in the past, where CETA Title I funds were used through arrangements with vocational educators, to provide the work experience component of a cooperative work experience program in vocational education, no serious problems arose with respect to awarding academic credit. Similarly, when CETA Title I funds were used to provide work experience for CETA eligible youth not associated with vocational education programs, it has not been typical to even ask for academic credit. Now, under YETP, the awarding of academic credit for YETP experiences is considered to be an essential part of the LEA/prime sponsor agreement.

The problem is further complicated by the fact that work experience, under YETP, can be awarded for: (a) career exploration; (b) career awareness; and for (c) supplementing vocational education classroom instruction. In addition, under YCCIP, work experience may be provided primarily for purposes of providing income to youth. Of these four possible purposes of work experience, only that which relates directly, in a cooperative work experience fashion, with vocational education has clearly been eligible for academic credit in the past. There is, indeed, a real question if one requests *academic* credit for such YEDPA activities as those associated with acquiring good work habits, becoming aware of and exploring careers, and developing positive attitudes toward the work place. While of unquestioned educational relevance as preparation for work, the question of whether or not such activities are deserving of academic credit is a legitimate one. Some would say that providing academic credit for such activities would be analogous to providing academic credit for career counseling—and few would think of doing that!

A third serious sub-concern expressed by CETA prime sponsor personnel had to do with the relative emphasis on "transition services" for *all* students as opposed to "career employment experiences" for CETA-eligible, economically disadvantaged youth. There seemed to be a strong feeling, among participants from CETA prime sponsor organizations, that the primary emphasis *must* be on "career employment experiences" for economically disadvantaged youth. Several expressed opinions that, if school districts attempt to place any kind of major emphasis on "transition services" for all in-school youth, ages 16-21, it will be highly resisted by CETA prime sponsors–in spite of the fact that it is allowable under the YETP provisions.

Objections to a "transition services" emphasis, on the part of CETA prime sponsor persons, centered around two things. First, they feel strongly that the primary emphasis of the entire CETA operation *must* be on economically disadvantaged persons, not on all in-school youth. Second, they feel equally strongly about the lack of clear accountability measures available for evaluating the effectiveness and the effect of what, in the YETP rules and regulations, are referred to as "transition services." It is vitally important that education personnel responsible for negotiating LEA/prime sponsor agreements under YETP understand these prime sponsor concerns.

Finally, a fifth concern of CETA prime sponsor personnel is the need for school districts to understand the potential contributions YEDPA holds for affecting positive educational change. They are fearful that educators may be expecting some things from YEDPA that cannot be delivered while, at the same time, failing to look realistically at what YEDPA could do in a positive fashion.

The single greatest contribution CETA prime sponsor personnel see their efforts making to education change is through the demonstration of effective new approaches for meeting the educational and career preparation needs of economically disadvantaged youth. By concentrating large sums of money on devising new ways of meeting the previously unmet needs of economically disadvantaged youth, they feel strongly they may be uncovering some new methods and procedures that, in future years, may well be adopted by the education system for all youth. Their numerous experiences with school dropouts have convinced them that educational change is needed if such youth are to remain in high school until graduation. The CETA effort in general and the YEDPA effort in particular allow such new models to be developed either as extensions of the regular school offerings or, often, as some form of alternative educational programs.

A second contribution that YEDPA is seen as making to education can be pictured as supplementing currently existing efforts of school systems; i.e., not

necessarily doing things differently, but simply doing more. A good case in point is seen in YEDPA efforts to cut the counselor/pupil ratio from, say, 1:500 to 1:50—or even as low as 1:10. A second example might be provision, through CETA, of a computerized career information system available to all high school students and paid for from YETP funds.

A third possible contribution to improving the education system can be made by CETA prime sponsor personnel by serving as consultants to educators. Such consultation may help educators to discover more effective ways of using community resources and of reaching the "hard to reach" economically disadvantaged youth who, in many school systems, are currently not being well served. Several expressed this possibility by pointing out that, while the YEDPA legislation mandates that CETA prime sponsors must consult with educators, it does not mandate that educators should consult with CETA prime sponsors. CETA prime sponsors move in different circles of influence than do typical educators including, for example, contacts with such key and influential groups as: (a) National Association of Counties; (b) U.S. Conference of Mayors; (c) National League of Cities; and (d) National Governor's Conference. Their contacts with such groups, and with the many community-based organizations associated with them, could represent a valuable resource for educators interested in community collaborative efforts in career education.

In short, CETA prime sponsor representatives were expressing concerns that: (a) too many educators are complaining about the alternative education systems being championed by CETA rather than looking to such systems as ideas for positive educational change; (b) too many educators are resisting CETA efforts to supplement the resources of educators and, instead, are isolating themselves too much from the broader community; and (c) too many educators are failing to take advantage of the expertise of CETA prime sponsor personnel in serving as resource consultants for school systems concerned with finding new and better ways of meeting the needs of economically disadvantaged persons. Certainly, it would seem that educators should listen, and respond appropriately, to these kinds of concerns.

It has not been the purpose of this section to, in effect, ask educators to "give in" to the kinds of CETA prime sponsor concerns outlined here. Rather, the assumption has been that the art of compromise, so essential to making good LEA/prime sponsor agreements, demands that both parties begin by developing a mutual basic understanding of and respect for the thoughts of the other. We have attempted here to present such concerns from the standpoint of the CETA prime sponsor. Near the end of this monograph, an attempt will be made to present some of the basic concerns educators face with respect to the YEDPA legislation.

With this background, we turn now to descriptions of current YIEP and YETP efforts as reported by participants in these mini-conferences.

Descriptions of Youth Incentive Entitlements Projects (YIEP)

It will be recalled, from our earlier discussion of YEDPA, that YIEP is best viewed as a massive experiment aimed at determining the effect of providing part-time work experience to high risk potential dropouts that will encourage them to remain in high school until graduation. A second purpose of this "experiment" is to test the efficacy of providing similar rewards to economically disadvantaged youth, ages 16-19, who have already dropped out of high school to return and obtain a high school diploma. Being an experimental project, YIEP has operated by investing a relatively large number of dollars in a relatively few sites. The majority of YIEP funds has been invested in what DOL has termed "Tier I" sites with smaller amounts designated for "Tier II" sites. When DOL was asked to send representatives to the 1977-78 mini-conferences, it elected, for one of the mini-conferences, to limit attendance to persons actively engaged in Tier I YIEP operations. As a result, fairly detailed description of some Tier I YIEP efforts were collected. It is the purpose of this section to summarize YIEP efforts in those sites represented at the mini-conference in which they were involved.

King Snohomish Manpower Consortium–Seattle, Washington. Composed of nine local governments, this consortium has been in existence for a number of years. Its primary purpose has been to play a planning/control/monitoring function for manpower efforts in the Greater Seattle area–efforts that have included manpower studies. When the YEDPA legislation was enacted into law, the consortium decided to apply for a YIEP entitlement program grant primarily because the YIEP effort seemed similar, in many ways, to what the consortium had been attempting to do all along. Because of the nine local governments involved, this consortium effort covers a full two county area involving rural and suburban areas as well as Seattle itself. In all, it includes 32 public school districts and five community college districts.

Within this area, the consortium identified a total of 10,000 youth, ages 16-19, who met the legal requirements for participation in YEIP. Of these eligible youth, the breakdown was as follows:

(a) 1,400 are being served by YETP

(b) 2,000 are being served by SPEDY (the Summer Title III CETA program)

(c) 1,500 youth were identified who did not want to participate

(d) 5,100 (approximately) are to be served in this YIEP effort (with about 2,000 slots available for the academic year and the remainder combined with SPEDY in a summer only program)

The YIEP entitlement grant received by the consortium was $11.8 million for its first full year of operation. The newness of this effort provided an unusual opportunity to identify a series of practical problems which others may find themselves facing. It was fortunate to be able to capture the basic nature of such problems at this time, i.e., it seems certain that, before long, each will be solved and the kind of description provided here would be impossible to provide.

One practical problem was associated with the obvious need to move into action quickly. With 32 school districts involved, it was necessary to work out agreements with all 32 simultaneously—a far different problem than is faced in a YETP LEA/prime sponsor agreement involving only one prime sponsor and one school district. This situation has limited initial efforts largely to (a) attempts to improve and expand school-based guidance efforts, and (b) development of the required part-time work experience slots, through sub-contracts with CBOs, in the private sector (about 10 percent of such slots) while devoting much effort to the development of similar slots in the public sector. The need to develop a comprehensive set of support services is obvious, but is not something that can be accomplished instantly.

A second practical problem was encountered when attempts were made to encourage out-of-school youth to participate. Two things happened here: (a) many out-of-school youth were apparently not motivated by the offer of only $43 per week payment for their part-time jobs (i.e., they had made better accommodations for themselves) and (b) the public schools had problems figuring out what to do with a school dropout who, say, elected to return to the 11th grade in February. Where does that dropout fit? How can she/he be expected to catch up with the rest of the class? The school systems were unprepared to offer a full scale alternative education program to school dropouts and the community colleges were full. Some help on this problem was received from mobile GED teachers employed by community colleges, but this cannot be a long-run solution.

A third practical problem was encountered when the question of monthly reports to be submitted by each of the 32 school districts was considered. In the first place, only $25,000 was available for use in obtaining such reports. In the second place, school districts found it difficult to meet the YIEP requirement that they certify whether the YIEP participant was meeting the "minimal academic and attendance requirements of the school district." Not

many public school districts had established such formal "minimum requirements." In the third place, in order to meet the YIEP research requirements, school records of YIEP participants had to be examined which resulted in questions regarding possible violations of privacy laws.

From the school system's side, it has been difficult for them to see exactly where the YIEP effort fits into the career education/vocational education/work study efforts already established in the school system. Further, to do all that YIEP asks demands that the role and functions of school counselors be changed, thus raising questions regarding the educational justification for doing so. Finally, school systems must be concerned about how the YIEP emphasis on public service job slots fits in with the school system's already established patterns of working with the private sector.

In spite of these problems, the consortium YIEP effort is operating effectively and appears to hold high potential for meeting its goals established for this, its first year of operation. The long years of professional manpower experience represented in the consortium itself, coupled with good educational cooperation and sincere community commitment to YIEP-eligible youth, make it appear likely that the kinds of practical problems outlined here will be resolved. It is the nature of the general problems—not the fact that they occurred in this project—that is important to emphasize here.

Detroit, Michigan. The YIEP entitlement grant in Detroit was obtained by the Manpower Department, City of Detroit who, in turn, subcontracted the entire YIEP operation to the Detroit public school system. Like most other major urban areas, Detroit public schools currently enroll a large number of youth who are eligible for participation in YIEP. Thus, the initial effort of this YIEP project has been limited to 15,000 in-school, YIEP-eligible youth.

The availability of an initial YIEP grant of $9 million (covering only part of a full year's operation) has enabled the Detroit public schools to retain many teachers who, otherwise, would have been dropped from the teaching ranks because of lack of funds. Such teachers are actively engaged in providing intensive educational services to participating YIEP youth.

The YIEP effort fits very well into the master plan for educational reform adopted about a year ago by the Detroit public schools. In a very real sense, YIEP is viewed in Detroit as a way of implementing what the Detroit school system had already decided it wanted to do in terms of meeting needs of YIEP-eligible youth. Thus, the Detroit public schools have been able to handle almost the entire YIEP effort by themselves. The only significant function that the CETA prime sponsor performs is processing the payroll for participating youth in connection with the part-time jobs provided under YIEP.

Because of the very powerful influence of organized labor in the Detroit area, it was necessary for the YIEP work experience slots to be developed primarily in the public service, rather than in the private, sector of the Detroit economy. As an operation run by the schools themselves, there have been no problems encountered in terms of the academic credit question nor in terms of reporting mechanisms. YIEP, to date, has effectively functioned simply by being absorbed as an integral part of the total offerings of the Detroit public school system.

Boston, Massachusetts. Implemented by a CETA prime sponsor, this YIEP effort is already operational. With $23 million available for use through FY '79, the program is expected to serve 5,450 YIEP-eligible youth during the school year and, supplemented by SPEDY funds, about 6,100 during the summer months. Of these, approximately 75 percent will be in-school youth from four of the eight Boston school districts and 25 percent will be YIEP-eligible, out-of-school youth. Out of 12,000 expected job sites, there are between 5,000-6,000 confirmed for use in YIEP now. There are, by conservative estimates, about 8,000 YIEP-eligible youth in the area served at any given time, with about 10,000-12,000 during the entire 18-month period of this YIEP project.

In Boston, YIEP operates from a very centralized system with all support services supplied by the prime sponsor—services that include counseling, job development, occupational information, and others. The system works something like this:

a. Youth learn about YIEP through the Boston YES program;

b. Youth can go to any of 75 places for initial application;

c. After applying, eligible youth spend four to six weeks with an intake counselor who assists the youth with performance and skills in form completion;

d. Youth profiles are then matched with jobs under subcontract with the Boston Employment Service and a youth/job match is made;

e. An Employment Education Development Plan (EEDP) is developed for each YIEP participant that provides conditions for both the youth and for the work site supervisor to follow.

Of the total YIEP participants in this effort, Boston expects about 20 percent to be placed in the private sector, 40 percent in the non-profit sector, and 40 percent in government settings. Using Title 6B CETA funds as part of the prime sponsor "match" for this YIEP effort, 220 counselors have been

employed to serve YIEP youth on a 1:25 ratio. While these connselors are minimally qualified, each is supervised, on a 1:10 ratio, by a "case manager"—a professional counselor paid by YIEP funds. Each counselor is expected to spend about one hour per week with each YIEP youth. It is this low counselor/enrollee ratio that has really sold YIEP in Boston.

While the Boston school system has no financial participation in the YIEP program, they do have active involvement in terms of helping to publicize the program, assisting with the intake procedure, monitoring YIEP participants, and working with others on job development. In 11 of the participating Boston schools, Boston "YES" workers, paid by the Employment Service, are in the schools. In a very real way, this represents a kind of subsidy to the schools. Nine Catholic high schools in Boston are also involved in this very ambitious effort. All operations are closely monitored by the CETA prime sponsor who is in charge of the whole YIEP Boston effort.

Cincinnati, Ohio. Like Detroit, the Cincinnati YIEP effort is operated under a subcontract with the public school system. Under this $15 million contract covering an 18-month period, the Cincinnati public schools will operate a YIEP program for 2,500 in-school youth while, at the same time, providing for 400 out-of-school youth through a separate subcontract between the school system and the Cincinnati Citizens Committee on Youth (CCY).

The YIEP application effort was undertaken by an advisory board of directors put together by the City Manager and the Superintendent of Schools. It includes representatives from such organizations as the CCY, the United Way, Chamber of Commerce, and AFL/CIO. The Advisory Board is headed by the Director of Guidance for the Cincinnati public school system.

Under this YIEP plan, there is one YIEP coordinator for each 60 participating youth charged with developing appropriate work sites and for maintaining close contact with youth, their teachers, and their principals. In addition, using the YIEP funds, they have a counselor/YIEP participant ratio 1:50 in addition to the regular counseling services already provided by the school system.

The entire YIEP effort in Cincinnati is best characterized as an individualized program with all student services available to each participant. Relatively greater attention is being paid to developing favorable work attitudes in participants than in providing specific vocational skills. Similarly, in this YIEP effort, the educational experience each youth receives is judged as more important than his/her work experience. It represents a school system-wide effort to provide the kinds of *added* services, attention, and help needed to provide true *equity* in education for needy youth enrolled in the

high schools of Cincinnati. Without YIEP, many of these youth are seen as persons who would have been forced to leave the school system prior to graduation with no good preparation for work.

Baltimore, Maryland. Like Boston, the Baltimore YIEP effort is headed by a CETA prime sponsor. In addition to the $23 million of YIEP funds received, approximately $7 million from CETA Title VI and SPEDY are used in the Baltimore YIEP effort. Over an 18-month period, this project will serve a total of 10,600 youth with 8,843 slots available at any given time. Of these, approximately 1,900 slots are reserved for out-of-school youth returning to high school while the remainder are in-school youth. Also similar to Boston is the fact that the Baltimore YIEP project found it necessary to limit itself to only a portion of Baltimore City in spite of the fact the CETA prime sponsor area covers five counties as well as all of Baltimore itself.

Of the approximately 9,000 job slots developed, about 50 percent are in the public sector, about 20 percent in the private sector, and the remainder in nonprofit agencies. Unlike some other YIEP sites, Baltimore is counting heavily on persons at the job sites to screen youth for YIEP eligibility—a function that saves undue reliance on school counselors. School counselors enter in only when this is not possible. As a result, many YIEP participants find jobs close to their homes. Screening for private sector jobs is done through a job fair with private sector representatives allowed to "cream" youth for the private sector slots.

A very unique feature of the Baltimore YIEP effort is their procedure for screening and meeting needs of out-of-school youth. The system works like this:

A. For youth reading below 5th grade level:

   1. Option "A": They can enroll in a special new public school for youth with severe reading disabilities. At this new school, 200 of the 300 slots have been reserved for YIEP participants. Academic credit is given.

   2. Option "B": Up to 50 YIEP youth can participate in a $150,000 LEAA-funded program operated by CBOs in Baltimore. No academic credit is received for this program.

B. For youth reading at the 5th-8th grade level:

   1. Option "A": They can attend one of four area vocational high schools which are being kept open, with YIEP funds, from 3:30-7:30 p.m. to serve 600 YIEP youth. With both academic and vocational teachers involved, this program can lead to a high school diploma.

2. Option "B": They can attend the Harbor City Learning Program, an alternative school program jointly staffed by prime sponsor persons and educators from the school system. Using six occupational clusters, this program alternates classroom instruction with on-the-job activities in two-week cycles. This highly individualized curriculum can produce high school graduates in two years even for those who never attended high school.

C. For youth reading at the 8th grade level or higher:

1. Option "A": A GED program (funded by YIEP) is run by the public school system for 240 YIEP youth.

2. Option "B": YIEP youth can attend the Middle College program operated with the Community College of Baltimore. This program provides both a GED and an AA degree in two years in oceanography or marine science. Of 400 available slots, 200 are reserved for YIEP youth and 200 for YETP youth.

The Baltimore YIEP program requires an 80 percent attendance rate and a "60" academic average for youth who participate. YIEP funds are available to pay for all needed supportive services. The school system and the prime sponsor are working very closely together on this YIEP project. No major problems are seen.

In summary, the five Tier I YIEP programs described here can be seen to include approximately 30,000 in-school and 3,600 out-of-school youth at a total cost, exclusive of other CETA funds used in Boston and Baltimore, of about $81.8 million. Four of the five are concentrated in urban areas and one covers suburban and rural areas as well as a major city. Of the five, three are being operated by CETA prime sponsors or community groups closely associated with a CETA prime sponsor while two are being conducted by public school systems. The ones run directly by CETA prime sponsors (Boston and Baltimore) have by far the largest amount of funds per YIEP enrollee and, in addition, have found ways of supplementing YIEP funds with other kinds of CETA dollars. The two run by public school systems seem to be concentrating relatively more on improving educational offerings for YIEP youth whereas those operated by prime sponsors pay relatively more attention to the kinds of job slots created under YIEP. The contrast in approach, philosophical commitment and concern, and resources available for these various YIEP efforts is considerable. Certainly, as a research effort, it should produce some very valuable data. The one thing that these five YIEP projects appear to have in common is their desire and actions aimed at improving the quality of

educational experiences for YIEP youth related to attaining the goal of education as preparation for work.

Problems Encountered in Early YETP Efforts

No attempt was made to collect case examples of YETP efforts for purposes of contrast with the YIEP efforts described above. Participants in the YETP mini-conference appeared more interested in sharing experiences regarding common problems they were encountering than in giving detailed descriptions of their individual YETP efforts. Thus, it is a summary of such problems with which this section is concerned.

Problem 1: Encouraging educators to emphasize and value the goal of education as preparation for work. Several YETP participants perceived educators' resistance, with respect to YETP implementation in school settings, coming from two perspectives: (a) resistance to a positive approach toward helping youth solve education/work relationship problems; and (b) resistance to paying special attention to the needs of YETP youth. Both problems were illustrated in reports of YETP youth whose part-time jobs were as teacher aides in the school system. While the specific teachers to whom such youth were assigned appeared to be working positively with them, other teachers were reported to be downplaying the importance of contributions being made by YETP youth in their teacher aid assignments. This was seen, in part, as due to an attitude that the work these students were doing was secondary in importance to their academic studies—thus denying some students the positive reinforcement such work will hopefully provide. In part, some felt this was due simply to the fact that some teachers appear to be threatened by the possibility that, if enough teacher aides are employed, perhaps the school system won't need as many regular teachers. The overriding concern, however, was that some teachers, by not valuing the work YETP youth are doing as teacher aides, are making negative, rather than positive, contributions to helping such youth value work and themselves as workers.

The same problem was seen as existing among some school counselors. In part, participants identified the problem as an apparent lack of interest or concern on the part of some counselors for YETP-eligible youth. Reportedly, it was, in effect, almost a disbelief that YETP efforts could possibly succeed with such youth when educators had demonstrated convincingly that not much could be done. When special efforts were made, through YETP, to improve the quality of counseling services (for example, through introducing such added features as a computerized occupational information system and expanded career exploration opportunities) some counselors appeared to feel threatened.

The general problem identified was clearly an attitudinal one that saw some educators being perceived by CETA personnel as: (a) resistant to emphasizing the goal of education as preparation for work (b) less interested in YETP-eligible youth than in other youth with whom they worked; and (c) threatened by attempts to supplement what they had previously done with new and expanded services for YETP-eligible youth. Such negative attitudes do not suddenly disappear if directions come to educators from top administrative leaders in the school system that they are to cooperate in a YETP effort. Community pressures may often have to be put on top administrative leaders in education to get them to act. Changing teachers and counselors, however, is going to take time as well as creative, new strategies. Attitude change doesn't occur quickly.

Problem 2: Providing academic credit for YETP experiences. The experiences of seminar participants differed widely with respect to gaining academic credit for YETP participation. Some were having no problems of any kind while others have not yet sought academic credit. Still others were finding it possible to gain academic credit for some YETP experiences, but not for others. The most obvious problems will be summarized here.

One problem is that most school districts now being asked to participate in YETP have not had prior experience in granting academic credit for work experience. Some school districts, in the past, had established procedures for granting academic credit for work experience, carried out as a regular part of vocational education. These districts seemed to be having little trouble arranging academic credit for YETP participants. To those schools who had no prior experience in granting academic credit for work experience, the challenge to change in this direction was sometimes difficult to meet.

A second practical subproblem here is that, in the past, CETA Title I programs often operated in secondary school settings under arrangements where no academic credit was offered for participating youth. Questions were raised regarding the probable negative reactions of CETA Title I youth if academic credit for work experience is offered to YETP youth. Apparently, at the school district and local CETA office levels, there still is much to be done in making clear distinctions between: (a) academic credit offered as part of a cooperative work experience program in vocational education; (b) academic credit offered for CETA Title I youth whose part-time jobs are unrelated to their academic programs; and (c) academic credit offered for career exploration work experience under YETP. To many, "work experience" seems to be a generic term. There is an obvious need to differentiate the various kinds of work experience involved here.

A third subproblem was seen in those school districts where distinctions are being drawn between giving *elective* academic credit for work experience but not academic credit that counts toward minimal high school graduation requirements. The distinction is clear to professional educators, but not apparently well understood by some CETA personnel involved in YETP activities. The criteria used by local school boards to determine whether credit given for a given educational activity should count toward graduation or should, instead, count as "elective" credit, are often unclear. Differences between local school boards are great. The above problems are bound to create some confusion in negotiating LEA/prime sponsor agreements on matters related to academic credit.

Problem 3: Involving the private sector in YETP. The YETP effort, unlike other parts of the YEDPA legislation, places high priority on helping youth engage in career exploration which, as the YEDPA law itself states, in Section 346(10)(c)(1), "will improve their ability to make career decisions and which will provide them with basic work skills needed for regular employment not subsidized under this in-school program." Since many youth will eventually work in the private, rather than the public sector, it is imperative that YETP efforts involve career exploration for YETP youth in the private sector. Several subproblems were raised by participants.

One subproblem is the fact that, under CETA, the STIP (Skill Training Improvement Program) is already in existence. This CETA program allows employers to be directly involved in the selection of trainess and in the actual training of persons to fill the immediate needs of private industry. When employers see YETP efforts to involve them in what is obviously a long-term developmental effort that may or may not ever produce persons for their particular industry, it is easy to understand why the YETP option appears less attractive than the STIP option to many employers. The task is to convince industry that the developmental YETP effort will result in a better potential pool of employees for industry.

A second subproblem raised by participants had to do with perceived problems YETP career exploration efforts in the private sector may have in gaining the cooperation and support of organized labor. If organized labor views YETP as either (a) threatening to displace some adult employed workers; or (b) exploiting youth, it is sure to resist. Some participants reported this to be no problem in their communities, but others emphasized it as a factor which may well prevent the kinds of varied involvement of the private sector that YETP seeks. The solution suggested by participants was to seek the active involvement and consultation of representatives from organized labor on a continuing basis in YETP operations. It is understandable that organized labor may object to activities in which their advice and operational assistance isn't sought.

A third subproblem identified was one that involves working with only a portion of the private sector in a given community. Realistically, some elements of the private sector, like some elements of the education system, are sure to resist and resent YETP operations. It was the feeling of participants that prior CETA programs, such as the VEP effort described earlier, will be helpful in gaining support and understanding from the private sector. From a practical standpoint, participants urged others involved in YETP to concentrate their efforts on those industries most susceptible to working positively with school systems and CETA prime sponsors on YETP programs rather than attempting to cover the entire private sector. The advice was "go with the winners!"

In the long run, participants saw the success of YETP programs directly related to the successful implementation of comprehensive career education efforts in the participating school districts and in the communities where they are located. At the same time, it was recognized that the full implementation of career education efforts is still to be attained in many, many communities. It will not be quick nor will it be easy.

Examples of Ways in Which YETP Programs are Supplementing Educational Opportunities

One of the underlying premises of the YETP portion of the YEDPA legislation is that YETP funds are to be used to supplement, but not supplant, efforts already being made by school districts in preparing youth for work. Several examples of ways in which this philosophical premise is being converted into operational reality were provided by seminar participants.

In Cincinnati, Ohio, because of the extensive YIEP effort at the senior high school level, YETP funds are being used exclusively for career awareness/ exploratory programs for 14- and 15-year olds. The YEDPA law that makes this kind of use of YETP funds possible for use with 14- and 15-year olds has not yet been applied in many other communities. The Cincinnati example is well worth examining.

In Wilmington, Delaware, YETP funds are being used to supplement regular offerings in a county vocational school through providing 120 in-school and 80 out-of-school YETP-eligible youth with: (a) business/labor/industry resource persons for classroom discussion of careers; (b) special career exploration opportunities in six occupational clusters; and (c) special efforts to show YETP youth the necessity of academic skills as preparation for work. All of this is in addition to everything the vocational school was previously doing.

In Houston, Texas, YETP funds, supplemented by special funds from the Houston Independent School District, have been used to establish a "YETP Career Education Center" for 200 YETP youth participants as an alternative school. The extent to which the YETP funds resulted in adding to educational resources that would otherwise be available to YETP youth can be seen in comparison figures such as these:

Category	Regular HISD Students	YETP Career Ed Center
1. Teacher/pupil ratio	1:30	1:17
2. Counselor/pupil ratio	1:500	1:35 (in-school youth)
		1:10 (out-of-school youth)
3. Per pupil cost	$1,100	$3,000

In addition, the school district has assigned three full-time consultants to the YETP Career Education Center for purposes of providing staff development to teachers and counselors working at that Center.

In Humboldt County, California, YETP participants are provided with both special career counselors and with a wide variety of quality work experience at sites that are not available to regular students in the school systems. Regular classroom teachers have not, as yet, been much involved in the YETP effort, but plans are being made to expand YETP efforts to include staff development for regular academic teachers of YETP youth.

In Colorado Springs, Colorado, YETP funds have been used to install a computerized career information center in one high school that is made available for use by all students. In addition, YETP funds are being used to help 60 YETP youth greatly expand their opportunities in career exploration as a basis for making better career decisions. These activities have added considerably to the effectiveness of the career guidance and counseling services afforded youth.

In Kenosha, Wisconsin, YETP funds have been used to expand work experience programs having a primary goal of career exploration for YETP youth while, at the same time, paying youth for participating in such experiences. In addition, Kenosha is actively involved in finding ways of combining various kinds of Federal funds, from a wide variety of sources, with those of the education system, by providing a comprehensive career education emphasis in a new high school that is to be built soon.

With these examples, the question was raised whether or not "regular" students tended to resist these special efforts to provide, for YETP youth, the kinds of help all high school students feel is needed. In general, participants reported no such feelings of resentment existing in the early stages of YETP implementation. At the same time, they were cognizant of the possibility and seemed to feel this is a problem they will likely face in the near future.

Recommendations of Participants for Increasing the Effectiveness of YEDPA

Participants in both the YEDPA seminars suggested a number of ways in which the effectiveness of the entire YEDPA effort—with particular reference to relationships between LEAs and CETA prime sponsors—could be improved. Some of these suggestions were made by educators in the seminars and others by CETA prime sponsor representatives. In making suggestions, participants were urged to think creatively and not to hamper themselves with "practical" restraints that now exist in the communities where they work. While nearly all of these suggestions are ones that other communities could not easily implement, the entire set is reproduced here in the hope that one or more will at least be tried.

1. Get some national agreement, among educators and DOL personnel, on the goals of education, the goals of CETA, and the proper relationships among both sets of goals. Without this agreement, misunderstandings at the local level are certain to continue.

2. Help educators learn about the entire CETA legislation so that they can better view YEDPA in general and YETP in particular, and gain proper perspective as these new efforts relate to past CETA efforts and currently existing CETA opportunities for effective LEA/prime sponsor interaction.

3. Help CETA prime sponsors learn more about career education, its goals for educational change, and its potential for use in helping to implement better LEA/prime sponsor working agreements.

4. Embark on a major effort to help counseling and guidance personnel from education and from DOL settings join forces in helping youth solve their career guidance problems. The separateness now existing is hurting youth.

5. Collect, on a nation-wide basis, "success examples" of good LEA/prime sponsor agreements. Use this collection of "success examples" in a series of conferences involving teams of persons from local communities. Such "teams should include superintendents, CETA prime sponsors, school board members, and community leaders.

6. Simplify YEDPA rules and regulations in ways that maximize the degree to which local options exist. An essential step will be to provide some assurance of continuity of funds and more lead time to local communities. Without these things, don't expect local communities to change very much.

7. Help regional personnel in HEW and CETA regional offices learn more about YEDPA in general and LEA/prime sponsor agreements in particular. Use such persons as resources for LEAs and local prime sponsors. Depend less on Washington, D.C. bureaucrats and State government officials.

8. Obtain some basic agreements with respect to evaluation measures to be used by school systems to demonstrate their accountability for receiving YEDPA funds. Performance standards are badly needed that can be applied by CETA prime sponsors to school districts. These must go beyond the area of "general employability skills" as this term is too fuzzy for use in true accountability. Consider a plan whereby a school system meeting performance standards receive a "bonus" of CETA funds.

9. Devise and implement a plan where YEDPA funds going to school districts are matched with funds from the school district itself.

As a set of suggested action steps for consideration by decisionmakers at the Federal, regional, State, and community levels, this set of nine basic suggestions for improvement would seem to deserve some serious consideration. These suggestions have come from practitioners charged with implementing the YEDPA legislation and they represent the professional experiences of such persons. Who can know better what kinds of help educators and CETA prime sponsor personnel, at the community level, need?

Philosophical Issues to be Resolved in LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements

It would be both unfair and untrue to picture all educators as belonging in one philosophical "camp" and all CETA prime sponsors as belonging in an opposing "camp." Many from both sides would, in fact, be placed in the "opposition camp" if their individual philosophical positions were to be carefully examined. Further, to try to differentiate "camps" is to run the danger of setting up a series of "straw men" which, in many local communities, simply do not exist. In spite of these obvious and very great dangers, it seems necessary, at this point, to posit a series of basic philosophical differences that appear to be currently impeding the development and implementation of LEA/prime sponsor agreements that could provide maximum benefits to

youth. I present these issues here, not to further divide, but rather to establish a basis for compromise. Both will have to "give" some.

Issue #1: Should our efforts be aimed at improving our current education system or at creating a system of alternative schools? Typical CETA prime sponsors appear firmly convinced that the American education system has failed to meet the needs of many persons in our society in terms of preparing such persons to be productive, satisfied, contributing workers. They see the results of such failure on a daily basis in the large numbers of unemployed, underemployable persons with whom they must deal. Research sponsored largely by the U.S. Department of Labor over the last 15-year period has provided clear indications that some alternative approaches to education may produce more positive results. Why, say such prime sponsors, should we put more money into an educational system that has consistently failed to provide for the needs of so many of our citizens? Would it not be better to devise and fund alternative educational programs that hold promise of succeeding where the public education system has failed? Results are what count—not the "cost per student."

Typical professional educators would be among the first to recognize and acknowledge that the American system of education has failed to meet the needs of all those it seeks to serve. At the same time, they would strongly defend a contention that holds the American system of education as the best yet devised for meeting the needs of ***all*** of the children of ***all*** of the people. If this system has failed to fully accomplish its objectives for all, the basic problem is that sufficient resources have not been made available for use by educators. They would further contend that, if new funds become available in American society for educational uses, the most efficient and effective use to which they could be put would be to improve the existing system of education, not to create a dual system that competes with it. Many examples exist in other countries of the dangers that a dual system of education holds for protecting and enhancing freedom of choice for the individual. Why repeat that mistake in America? Finally, many typical educators, when they see the large per pupil expenditures required for operating some kinds of "alternative schools," are quick to contend that, if our public schools were given this amount of money per pupil, it could produce results as good or better than those being produced by the alternative school.

Both "sides" have strong arguments in their favor. Perhaps some move toward compromise will become possible if the notion of "alternative schools" for those with special needs were to be incorporated within the concept of the total system of American public education. A more likely compromise position would be one that recognizes and accepts the premise that, if and when new funds become available for education in America, part of those funds should be

earmarked for creating alternative schools and part for improving the current system of public education. To use such large sums of new education dollars as the YEDPA legislation provides for only one of these ways does not seem wise—no matter which way is chosen.

Issue #2: Should the primary focus be on meeting developmental needs of persons or on meeting remedial needs? Typical CETA prime sponsors would appear to favor remedial over preventive approaches to solving education/work problems. They base their position on two very convincing arguments. First, they would contend, most members of American society are receiving sufficient help in meeting their career development needs; i.e., they go through the education system and take their place in the occupational society with reasonable assurances of success. At the same time, there are others—many others—whose career development needs have clearly not been met. Unless efforts are concentrated on providing such persons with the kinds of intensive remedial help they need, they will continue to be a burden on society rather than contributing members. Second, they contend that the concept of "developmental needs" is fuzzy, to say the least, and not susceptible to clear accountability for its results. How do you really know what you get for your money if you spend it on "developmental efforts?" On the other hand, money spent for remedial purposes can be held to strict accountability standards. We know the kinds of help such persons need and we can tell whether our efforts produce it.

Typical educators would appear to favor the developmental, over the remedial, approach. They would favor the old saying "an ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure." In looking at the large and increasing pool of out-of-school, out-of-skill, out-of-work, out-of-hope youth and adults in our society, they would raise two questions. First, they would question whether any amount of new money, no matter how massive, would ever be sufficient to "drain" this large pool of unfortunate persons. Persons are entering the pool faster than those who are in it can be helped. It is a losing cause to devote all of our energies to a "draining the pool" emphasis. At least part of our efforts must be aimed at cutting off the "flow" into that pool—and that, in a very real way, means devoting our resources to improving the education system from which such persons come. If we can cut off the flow into that pool by some substantial amount, it may be possible to "drain" it eventually. If we do not, the "pool" can only become larger.

Both "sides" are right again. Certainly, no thinking person would conclude that because remedial efforts are unlikely, by themselves, to produce complete success they should be abandoned. American society cannot afford simply to "write off" those now in the "pool" of youth and adults experiencing severe education/work relationship problems. At the same time, to concentrate total

attention on helping such persons without ever asking the question of "why are they here—and what can be done to prevent more from entering?" is both shortsighted and unwise. Our policies must be devised in such a way that they result in both kinds of efforts simultaneously—remedial *and* developmental. Only by doing so can we meet our responsibilities to those who are with us now and to those who will follow.

Issue #3: Should our efforts reach out to all youth under YEDPA or should they be concentrated on economically disadvantaged youth? Many typical CETA prime sponsors would undoubtedly not even see this as an issue. Instead, they would simply point to the law itself and contend that the basic intent of the Congress in this law is to provide for the special needs of the economically disadvantaged. Many portions of the YEDPA legislation would back up that contention. Further, the CETA's prime sponsors would contend that, to whatever extent YETP benefits derived from an LEA/prime sponsor agreement are intended to benefit *all* youth, these benefits will work to the detriment of economically disadvantaged youth. To provide *equality* for all is simply to widen the existing gap between the "haves" and the "have nots." Finally, the CETA's would defend concentrating attention on the economically disadvantaged by pointing out that it is *equity*, not *equality*, that is most needed in American society today. Economically disadvantaged youth tend to be both educationally disadvantaged and culturally disadvantaged. If America is to maximize opportunities for all of its citizens, then very special and intensive efforts must be mounted to provide equity for economically disadvantaged youth. Armed with such arguments, these sponsors can be expected to press strongly for YETP funds to be used for "career employment experiences" for the economically disadvantaged rather than for "transition services" to be made available to *all* youth.

Typical educators have been instilled with a philosophical belief that each student with whom they deal is equally important. They can be expected, in large numbers, to be philosophically opposed to doing more for one student than we are willing to do for another. Further, when the help being offered is in education/work relationships and career development, educators are quick to point out that the problems are, in no way, limited to economically disadvantaged youth. Rather, they represent major and growing problems that all youth face in American society today. If help is available in this crucial area, it should, they would say, be made available to all. Thus, in negotiating a YETP LEA/prime sponsor agreement, they can be expected to argue strongly for an emphasis on "transition services" for *all* secondary school students rather than an exclusive emphasis on "career employment experiences" for economically disadvantaged youth.

The Congress, in its wisdom, recognized the validity of both sides of this philosophical issue. This is undoubtedly what caused the Congress to include

both the concept of "transition services for all" and the concept of "career employment experiences" for the economically disadvantaged in the YETP portion of the YEDPA legislation. It is probably also what caused the Congress to write in requirements for LEA/prime sponsor agreements to be negotiated between local school systems and CETA prime sponsors at the local community level. This would seem to represent an ideal example of a situation where both "sides" can, and should, be willing to give in a little bit. To insist on all YETP funds being used for only one of these two major purposes when the Congress wrote both into the legislation is not defensible. With the way the YEDPA law was originally written, this will demand that the matter of the "22 *percent minimum*" be considered for what it really is—i.e., a *minimum*, not a *maximum*.

Issue #4: Should academic credit be awarded for all YEDPA youth activities or for only selected activities? Typical CETA prime sponsors can be expected to work toward maximizing the number of YEDPA youth activities for which educational institutions award academic credit. They are charged, by the YEDPA legislation, with doing so. They can be expected to argue that the granting of academic credit for work experience has, for years, been a standard educational practice in many parts of the nation. Further, they can be expected to contend that many of the coping skills included in YEDPA youth experiences will be valuable marketable skills later in life and are fully deserving of credit toward graduation. In addition, it will not seem unreasonable to CETA prime sponsors to feel that, if a particular activity costs money and involves effort, it is likely to be one for which academic credit could well be awarded. Finally, they can be expected to point out that, in such current educational activities whose primary purpose is career exploration, for example, the Executive High School Intern Program, academic credit has been awarded participants. Given this precedent, they may ask, why should not academic credit be awarded for career exploration experiences performed as part of the YETP program?

Typical educators may be expected to be very cautious about awarding academic credit for any activities not under the direct control and/or supervision of professional educators themselves. In the absence of such safeguards, they may ask How can the educational institution be sure that credit is earned? So far as work experience is concerned, educators will argue that some forms of work experience are deserving of academic credit while others are not. As a generic category, there is nothing inherent in "work experience" that makes it automatically worthy of academic credit. Further, while many educators may be willing to grant academic credit of an elective nature, they may not be willing to allow that credit to be given in a form that counts toward high school graduation. After all, they will say, we have strict guidelines regarding the kinds of learning activities for which academic credit

counting toward graduation may be awarded. Such guidelines are imposed by both State departments of education and by accrediting associations.

Finally, educators may be expected to contend that the personal value of a given experience to the future of a particular youth is not a proper criterion for use in determining whether or not that activity is deserving of academic credit counting toward graduation. The goals of American education extend beyond those concerned only with acquisition of subject matter content and many kinds of "credit" accrue to students reaching such goals, of which academic credit is but one.

The "academic credit" question in LEA/prime sponsor relationships will include all of these arguments—and more. There will be no easy answers nor ones that can be uniformly applied in every community. After all, the local school board possesses a great deal of latitude with respect to the awarding of academic credit and no national or State edict can force them to grant credit for YEDPA activities if they choose not to do so. Again, we are faced with an issue whose resolution will involve compromise on both "sides." Neither set of contentions is completely right nor completely wrong. Good faith bargaining in completing LEA/prime sponsor agreements, whether limited to YETP alone or covering wider parts of YEDPA or even total CETA legislation, will be essential.

Other basic issues could be raised such as the advisability of private vs. public sector work experience slots, questions regarding the importance of YEDPA funds for instructional use as opposed to support services, and issues involving postsecondary education youth in YEDPA. Future discussions that include such topics will be helpful. In the meantime, we can help both educational decisionmakers and CETA prime sponsors concentrate on finding ways of resolving, at the local level, the four basic issues identified in this section. Reasonable women and men on both "sides," who are equally concerned about providing maximum benefits to youth, will surely find reasonable solutions to each one of these issues.

Concluding Remarks

The contents of this monograph should be regarded by readers as both temporal and as tentative. They are certainly temporal in view of the fact that, by the time the monograph is in print, revisions in the YEDPA legislation will have been enacted into law. It is obvious, even as these words are being written, that some changes will occur in the law that will cause inaccuracies in what has been said here. The thoughts contained here were derived primarily from the input of eight representatives of CETA prime sponsors and nine educators, all of whom are involved in implementing YEDPA during its first year of

operation. These persons obviously represent only a very small sample of YEDPA practitioners and none of the national YEDPA leadership. Another sample of practitioners might well have provided a completely different set of examples and suggestions for use in this monograph. Thus, a warning of tentativeness must surely be given to readers.

In spite of these obvious weaknesses, it seemed to me the knowledge I gained from listening to the participants at the two 1978 YEDPA mini-conferences was so important and so new it would be worthwhile attempting to share it with others. It is to that end that this monograph is directed. If you, the reader, can use it to discover a more realistic "truth" about YEDPA and about LEA/prime sponsor interactions in your community, it will have served a useful purpose. Hopefully, both some of the problems and some of the promise of the YEDPA legislation have been clarified here.

APPENDIX A

Participants

Samuel Adams
Educational Specialist
Baltimore Public Schools
Program Liaison Office
3 East 25th Street
Baltimore, MD 21218

Erik Butler
Director of Youth Employment
and Training
City of Boston
15 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02201

Johnny Brown
Director, CETA Programs Division
City of Houston
1010 Louisiana – Suite 808
Houston, TX 77002

James Caradonio
Asistant Director of Occupational
and Vocational Education
Boston Public Schools
26 Court Street
Boston, MA 02108

Mary Carson
Assistant Superintendent for
Instructional Services
Seattle Public Schools
Administration & Services Center
815 – 4th Avenue, North
Seattle, WA 98109

Sam Dunlap
Community Liaison Worker
School District #11
115 North El Paso
Colorado Springs, CO 80907

Charles Hayward, Director
Division of Criminal Justice and
Manpower Programs
City/County CETA
City/County Building – 7th Floor
800 French Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

Willia Holloway
Assistant Superintendent
Cincinnati Public Schools
230 East 9th Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Bob Ivry
Manager, Youth Services
Mayor's Office of Manpower
Resources
701 St. Paul Street, Suite 500
Baltimore, MD 21202

Larry Marshall
Associate Superintendent for Alternate
Educational Programs
Houston Independent School District
3830 Richmond Avenue
Houston, TX 77027

Peter Marshall, Chairman
Tri-County CETA Consortium
6626 – 21st Avenue
Kenosha, WI 53140

Rick McKay
Division Director Planning
Analysis Division
King Snohomish Manpower
Consortium
1811 Smith Tower Building
Seattle, WA 98104

Gabrielle Parkinson
Director of Career Education
Humboldt County Superintendent of
Schools Office
P.O. Box 1408
Eureka, CA 95501

Georgia Saunders
Training Coordinator
Detroit Manpower Department
903 West Grand Boulevard
Detroit, MI 48208

Judd White, CETA Director
Humboldt County
922 – 4th Street, Suite 2
Eureka, CA 95501

Jack Winchester
Director of YEPTA Programs
105 East Vermijo – Suite 320
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Tom Zuhlke
Director of Federal Programs
Kenosha Unified School District
820 – 50th Street
Kenosha, WI 53140

APPENDIX B

Issues Raised by Participants

1. How can the YEDPA emphasis on out-of-school youth be handled in terms of problems facing schools with in-school youth?

2. How do you get out-of-school youth back in school? What do you do with them once they come back?

3. What is the redefined purpose of the American secondary school?--Academic excellence or school/work relationships?

4. How can we handle the present lack of coordination among YEDPA youth programs?

5. How can we meet the need for fast startup without a clear unified direction?

6. How can policies of a general nature be developed by CETA Prime Sponsors who deal, for example, with as many as 32 independent school districts?

7. How can the traditional CETA delivery system (developed for adults) be modified so as to best accommodate the youth emphasis of YEDPA?

8. How are we to meet the needs of the large numbers of needy school youth who aren't technically eligible for participation in YEDPA programs?

9. How can YEDPA continue to operate without clear direction from the Feds?

10. Is CETA an appropriate mechanism for giving youth good work habits and readying them for work?

11. Could YEDPA become a part of a more holistic effort combining YEDPA youth program with CETA programs for parents of YEDPA eligible youth?

12. How can CETA funds be channeled to those who need it most?

13. Where are the youth jobs anticipated as an outgrowth of YEDPA?

14. How can the flexibility of CETA be used to the advantage of YEDPA efforts?

15. How can the YEDPA effort be used in ways that orient it more around general employability skills and less around specific vocational skills?

16. What changes are needed in school systems to make collaboration happen?

17. How can an operational YIEP effort be mounted and still stick to the research design implied in the YEDPA legislation?

18. How can existing school efforts (such as EBCE and "adopt-a-school") be utilized in the YEDPA effort?

19. To what extent is the variety of school programs related to education/work causing problems of building relationships with the B/L/I community?

20. How can the CETA jobs—many of which *aren't* meaningful—be used to promote positive work values among participating youth?

21. How can a coordinated effort between CETA Prime Sponsors with *both* school systems and community based organizations (CBOs) be best worked out and implemented?

22. How can the YEDPA challenge of meeting needs of out-of-school youth be best met?

23. How can out-of-school youth be deeply involved in the YIEP research effort when such minimal incentives are provided to them for participation?

24. When a youth leaves YEDPA, what is the expected role of that youth in the broader economy of the community?

25. How can the adult oriented CETA effort be made to work best for youth given the recently added YEDPA effort?

26. How can the initial enthusiasm of CETA prime sponsors and local school districts for collaboration be converted into a *sustaining* effort?

27. How can *meaningful* work sites for YEDPA youth be developed?

28. How can the employment problem for out-of-school youth be moved from the drawing board to an operational effort?

29. To what extent should YEDPA look to development of alternative schools?

30. How can the variety of educational efforts in education/work be combined into a coordinated DOL/LEA relationship?

31. How can attitudinal problems related to YEDPA implementation be overcome?

32. How can individualized programs for YEDPA youth be best made?

33. How can YEDPA serve as an effective means of changing the school system?

34. How can the private sector become involved in YEDPA?

35. How can YEDPA generate hope in youth who have lost hope?—and still be realistic?

36. How to help schools get out of their conservatism that isolates them from the rest of the community?

37. How to deal with organized labor in YEDPA efforts?

38. How to use CETA to improve today's secondary schools?

39. How to get private industry to understand its role in YEDPA?

40. How to give hope to youth who now have little or none?

41. Implications of competency based graduation requirements for the YEDPA effort.

42. How can CETA best work with school counselors as part of the YEDPA effort?

43. How to communicate CETA opportunities to high school youth as part of YEDPA?

44. How to get the YEDPA effort to extend to multiple school districts through a single CETA prime sponsor?

45. How can YETP be used to improve the quality of school counseling?

46. How to use a CETA/LEA YEDPA effort to influence organized labor?

47. How to use the YEDPA effort to motivate teachers to emphasize education/work relationships?

48. How can CETA Prime Sponsors best communicate with school districts about YEDPA?

49. How can we encourage school systems to participate in the YEDPA effort?

50. How do we get the public schools to become more concerned about expanding support services to youth–beyond the curriculum itself?

51. How can schools be encouraged to use YETP funds to develop innovative programs for CETA eligible youth?

52. How to involve the private sector in the total YEDPA efffort?

53. How to get school systems to adopt program ideals CETA brings to them?

54. Who is to determine the destiny of the student? i.e., how can YEDPA become a truly joint CETA/LEA effort?

55. How can schools be encouraged to work with CETA to develop the most meaningful work sites for students?

56. How are school attendance requirements and CETA youth work experience efforts to be reconciled into a unified plan to help CETA eligible youth?

57. What will encourage school people and CETA people to work together?

58. How can a YETP effort be formed that accommodates such current youth needs as: (a) TV watching and (b) need for immediate gratification?

59. How can YETP be organized in ways that maximize community involvement for youth?

60. How to coordinate CETA, the variety of current educational efforts *and* other community efforts related to education/work?

61. How to maintain credibility for CETA in the community and in the schools?

62. How can the home/family structure become involved in the total YEDPA effort?

63. How can the YEDPA effort be operated in such a way that sustaining changes in education will result?

64. Could a CBO, of some kind, be used as a "broker" between the school system and CETA Prime Sponsors for YEDPA efforts?

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1978—621-968/378